TABLE 3-1
MWD 1998-99 WATER DELIVERIES AND LOCAL SUPPLIES (AF)

MWD MEMBER AGENCIES	LOCAL WATER SUPPLY	MWD WATER DELIVERIES[1]	TOTAL WATER USE	PREFERENTIAL RIGHT TO MWD SUPPLY[2]
Anaheim	59,531	15,238	74,769	16,380
Beverly Hills	0	13,545	13,545	21,420
Burbank	8,876	14,107	22,983	20,580
Calleguas M.W.D.	21,582	105,760	127,342	68,460
Central Basin M.W.D.	179,645	65,073	244,718	184,170
Coastal M.W.D.	19,863	27,579	47,442	50,400
Compton	4,914	4,734	9,648	5,880
Eastern M.W.D.	137,528	61,534	199,062	59,220
Foothill M.W.D.	8,367	8,824	17,191	14,490
Fullerton	24,751	6,431	31,182	12,810
Glendale	4,819	26,604	31,423	26,040
Inland Empire Utilities	169,323	48,629	217,952	49,980
Las Virgenes M.W.D.	3,798	19,413	23,211	13,440
Long Beach	27,911	44,857	72,768	58,170
Los Angeles	553,197	70,724	623,921	482,580
M.W.D. of Orange County	248,049	199,792	447,841	238,770
Pasadena	21,229	15,508	36,737	23,310
San Diego C.W.A.	150,173	454,436	604,609	302,190
San Fernando	3,481	0	3,481	2,520
San Marino	6,089	948	7,037	4,620
Santa Ana	36,962	12,436	49,398	15,330
Santa Monica	2,687	11,721	14,408	20,370
Three Valleys M.W.D.	66,590	62,410	129,000	48,930
Torrance	11,244	21,683	32,927	24,990
Upper San Gabriel Valley M.W.D.	170,191	7,131	177,322	93,450
West Basin M.W.D.	54,896	144,342	199,238	171,360
Western M.W.D.	193,397	70,194	263,591	70,560
TOTALS	2,189,093	1,533,653	3,722,746	2,100,000

Source: Metropolitan Water District
[1] Includes MWD's replenishment deliveries.
[2] Member agencies' preferential right to Metropolitan supplies in FY98-99 based on 2.1 MAF, which is what Metropolitan has represented as its firm supply.

Reliability Issues

Before 1964, Metropolitan had a firm allocation of 1.212 MAF of Colorado River water through contracts with the U.S. Department of the Interior, which was enough to keep Metropolitan's aqueduct full. However, as a result of the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Arizona vs. California, Metropolitan's firm supply fell to 550,000 AF. In recent years, Metropolitan has kept its aqueduct full through access to unused apportionments from other states or declarations of surplus water from the Department of Interior. This reduction in firm allocation is the most pressing issue Metropolitan faces regarding its Colorado River supplies.

Return to Contents

Water availability from the Colorado River is governed by a system of priorities and water rights that has been established over many years. The Colorado River Lower Basin states (California, Arizona, and Nevada) have an annual apportionment of 7.5 MAF of water. This supply is divided as follows: (1) California, 4.4 MAF; (2) Arizona, 2.8 MAF; and (3) Nevada, 300,000 AF. California agency priorities for water were established by the 1931 Seven Party Agreement. These priorities are shown in **Table 3-2**. As shown in the table, Metropolitan's 4th priority of 550,000 AF is junior to that of the first three priorities (3.85 MAF), which go to California agricultural agencies. Water used to satisfy priorities 5(a)-6(b) must come from unused allocations within California, Arizona, or Nevada or from surplus.

TABLE 3-2
SEVEN PARTY AGREEMENT PRIORITIES

PRIORITY	DESCRIPTION	AF/YR
1	Palo Verde Irrigation District	Priorities 1, 2, and 3 shall not exceed 3.85 MAF/YR
2	Yuma Project Reservation Division	Same as above
3 (a)	Imperial Irrigation District and lands in Imperial and Coachella valleys to be served by All-American Canal	Same as above
3 (b)	Palo Verde Irrigation District	Same as above
4	Metropolitan Water District	550,000
5 (a)	Metropolitan Water District	550,000
5 (b)	City/County of San Diego[1]	112,000
6 (a)	Imperial Irrigation District	
6 (b)	Palo Verde Irrigation District	300,000
	TOTAL	5,362,000

[1] In 1946 San Diego's rights were merged with and added to the rights of the Metropolitan Water District as one condition of the Authority's annexation to Metropolitan.

In recent years, Metropolitan has filled its aqueduct to capacity, using an average of 1.2 million acre-feet per year (MAF/YR) from the Colorado River. To do this, Metropolitan has relied on unused apportionments from Arizona and Nevada, unused apportionment from California agricultural agencies, and surplus water. But in recent years, Arizona and Nevada have increased water demand to near-apportionment levels, limiting the availability of unused apportionments to Metropolitan. Arizona's demand has been substantially increased by deliveries to an in-state groundwater banking program. Nevada is expected to begin banking water soon under an interstate water banking rule established by the Department of Interior in 1999, which allows Nevada to bank water in Arizona for Nevada's future use.

Metropolitan has been able to keep its aqueduct full in recent years through a successive string of annual surplus declarations by the Department of the Interior, beginning in 1996. Surplus water is also available for calendar year 2000. This has been made possible because above-normal precipitation has filled the river's